SOME NEW BOOKS.

Stubbs's History of the English Constitution.

It is strange that so little attention has yet been given in this country to Prof. STUBBS's remarkable work on the *Origin and Development of the English Constitution* (Macmillans). We should expect to see this book supplementing, if not superseding, Hallam's treatise on the same subject in the historical classes of our leading universities; but we observe that, even at Harvard, no reference is made to it in the latest catalogue. This is the more singular, because the specific purpose of the work was educational, Prof. Stubbs having been commissioned by the delegates of the Clarendon press to prepare a text book for the use of Oxford undergraduates. To his task he brought, however, such a comprehensiveness of research and capacity of insight and analysis, that the handbook contemplated acquired the proportions and authority of an exhaustive history, and at once took rank among the English classics. In a word, this investigation of English institutions is one of those performances which the Germans designate as epoch-making; and however familiar the student may be with the inquiries of Kemble, Palgrave, and Freeman, of Hume, Lingard, and Hallam, he is still imperfectly equipped and, so to speak, behind the times if he has neglected to acquaint himself with the results of this latest exploration in the same interesting field. We may add that the work of Prof. Stubbs covers the whole era of political evolution, from the Teutonic settlements in Britain to the accession of the Tudors, but we shall here confine ourselves to the first two volumes, which carry the description of English institutions from their germ in the original homes of Saxon and of Angle to the decisive recognition of the elective character of the monarchy by Henry IV., whose claim to rule was grounded solely on a Parliamentary title.

This is not a history of persons and events, but of institutions. So far, however, as the original mould and successive modifications of the national character and the pressure of events have coöperated in forming the existing Constitution, they compel scrutiny and measurement, and not the least striking feature of this book is the suggestiveness and weight of the concise, swift judgments pronounced on social and political incidents and individual men. These side strokes exhibit the keenness and candor of the author's mind, and it is especially to these we would direct attention, since the effort to compress in the space of a brief notice the main design and substance of a work which is itself a marvel of condensation would be quite preposterous. But before marking some of the crisp, pregnant sentences in which Canon Stubbs qualifies or sets aside the popular verdict on eminent personages of English history, it may be well to at least indicate the more general conclusions reached by his inquiry into the materials and dynamic agencies employed, and the sources of resistance and friction encountered, in the gradual development of the English Constitution.

In one direction the results of Prof. Stubbs's researches have led him to a conclusion different from that which other contemporary students of early England have seemed to favor. A good deal has of late been written about the continuous existence of Roman civilization in the cities and larger towns of Britain during the Anglian and Saxon colonizations, and about the permanence of the native British element in the agricultural districts, at all events throughout the west and southwest of England. Not a little evidence is also forthcoming as to the wide and permanent effects of the Danish settlements in the northeast, and especially of their great colonization of Northumbria and East Anglia in the ninth century. Prof. Stubbs holds, however, that while some admixture may very possibly have flowed from the two first-named sources, yet it affected rather the blood than the social and civic habits of the conquering race, and that even the extensive interfusion of the Danes has left no important trace on the political framework. This, in a word, is the keynote of his judgment on early English history, that the nation overthrown by William the Norman at Senlac was, as regards the specific aim of his own inquiry, namely, their institutions, a homogeneous people. They may have borrowed some refinement and industrial skill from the lingering vestiges of civilization in the Roman municipalities; they may have received religion and learning from the Celtic monasteries of the North, and the Danish imprint may be deep in the local customs and proper names of the Northumbrian region; but their political framework had remained intact, fashioned of native materials, and developed in accordance with purely English precedents and ideas. From a political point of view all the accessions above outlined were not so much impacted as absorbed. The process was not one of accretion, but of assimilation.

The system which William of Normandy found alive and vigorous in England was strong in the cohesion of its lower organisms, the association of individuals in the township, the hundred, and the shire, but it was extremely weak in its higher synthetical arrangements. An Anglo-Saxon was a Yorkshire man or man of Kent, not even a West Saxon or a Mercian, far less an Englishman. There was but a languid appreciation even of provincial action, much less a recognition of national duties; the individual's sympathies were bounded by his shire. The Norman race supplied the element which was wanted to create the English nation, by consolidating society in its higher ranges through the close relation to the crown of the tenants in chief whom the king had enriched. This process of consolidation, for the most part, went on within existing channels. So far as William could understand Anglo-Saxon usages he maintained them, and the oath of personal fidelity which he exacted of every free man, instead of being the initial point of the feudalization of England, is shown by Prof. Stubbs to have been a measure of precaution against the disintegrating power of Continental feudalism. A modified form of feudality was indeed introduced, but it was checked and speedily neutralized by the growth of a new administrative system without a parallel among contemporary states upon the Continent, having the source of its strength in the royal power. The difference in the effect of royal predominance upon the three estates of the barons, the clergy, and the people was, that under the firm administration of the sovereign the popular estate grew while the two others dwindled. Another important result of the depression of the feudatories by the kings of Norman race was that, in levelling them with the people, it gave the people natural leaders against the crown. By the time the crown, left apparently without a rival, began in its turn to claim immunity from the control of legal precedent and usage, to which it had subjected barons and clergy, the three estates, trained in and by royal law, had learned how law could be applied to the very power that forced the lesson upon them.

That portion of these volumes which deals with the struggle for the charters and the legislation of Edward I. is especially valuable. In a summary of his conclusions, Prof. Stubbs suggests that the final outcome of the royal action upon the constitution during the thirteenth century was to some extent the work of design, to some extent an undesigned development of the material which the artificer attempted to mould, and of the objects to which his attention was directed; and again, to some extent, the result of compulsion such as forced even Edward I., the greatest of Plantagenet kings, to carry out his own principles of constitutional design, even when they told against his momentary policy and threatened to thwart his own ultimate object. The design, as interpreted by the result, was the creation of a national Parliament, composed of the three estates, organized on the principle of concentrating local agency and machinery in such a manner as to produce unity of national action, and thus to strengthen the hand of the king, who personified the nation.

Between the despotism of the first Plantagenets and the despotism of the Tudors lies a period of three eventful centuries, two of which are traversed in these volumes. The first hundred years concludes with the perfected organization of a national legislature by Edward I.; the second closes with the revolution which gave Henry of Lancaster the crown, and which by that very outcome marked the growth of the permanent institutions. This was not in itself a victory of constitutional life, but it lifted to power a dynasty which reigned by a Parliamentary title, and which ceased to reign when it had lost the confidence of the Commons. The constitutional result of the three reigns that had filled the fourteenth century is the uprising of the House of Commons into its full share of political power, the recognition of its full right as the representative of the mass and body of the nation, and the vindication of its claim to exercise the functions which, in the preceding century, had been possessed by the Baronage only. But the rights of the Commons, we need not say, were not conclusively defined and firmly established at the close of the epoch examined in the two volumes before us. The struggle between royal prerogative and Parliamentary authority does not work out its own issue in the fate of Richard II. The decision is taken for the moment on a side issue—the wrongs of Henry of Lancaster; and the judicial condemnation of Richard is a statement, not of the actual causes of his deposition, but of the offences by which such a measure was justified. Prematurely Richard II. had challenged the rights of the nation, and the victory of the nation was premature. Between this triumph and the time when the representatives of the people would have to cope with the resolute despotism of the Tudors, another century of experiment, of friction, and of discipline intervened. The consolidation and development of the English Constitution amid the long civil wars of York and Lancaster is the subject of another installment of this history. With this brief reference to the general drift of his constitutional inquiry, we proceed to note such of the author's cursory but incisive judgments on men and on events as seem most likely to interest and impress the general reader. For example, this writer's estimate of William the Conqueror, though high, is cautious and discriminating. His was the rule, we are told, of a wise and wary, a strong and resolute, not a wanton and arbitrary, despot—a rule that avoided the evils of irresponsible tyranny, because he who exercised it had learned to command himself. Prof. Stubbs thinks it was most fortunate for the English in the hour of their great peril, when they had neither ruler, counsel, nor national system of their own, that they fell into the hands of one who was a law to himself, who discerned the coincidence of duty and policy, and preferred the forms of ancient royalty to the more ostentatious position of a feudal conqueror. No doubt William was a hard man, but he made and kept good peace, and amid the suffering inflicted by his heavy hand his subjects comprehended that there might be worse things to bear.

The author can see no reason to qualify the popular impression of the Conqueror's successor. Unrestrained by religion, by principle, or by policy, with no family interests to limit his greed, extravagance, or hatred of his kind, a foul incarnation of selfishness in its most abhorrent form, William Rufus gave to England and Christendom a ghastly pattern of absolutism. In the writer's judgment, it can only be ascribed to the weakness and disunion of those whom he had wronged that he burdened the throne and nation for twelve long years of misery. As might be expected, however, from his point of view, Prof. Stubbs is much less severe on the private vices of a sovereign than on his public transgressions. The personal character of Henry I. seems to have been detestable enough, but it was not directly injurious to the welfare of his people. Men thought diversely about him, Henry of Huntington tells us, and after he was dead said what they thought. Some spoke of his wisdom, prudence, eloquence, wealth, and victories; some of his cruelty, avarice, and lust; but, in the evil times that came after, the very acts of tyranny or of royal wilfulness seemed, in comparison with the much worse state of things present, most excellent. "He was," says Prof. Stubbs, "a strong ruler, with a clear view of his own interests, methodical, sagacious, and far-sighted; his selfish aims dictated the policy that gave peace and order to his people; destroying his enemies, he destroyed theirs, and by enforcing order he paved the way for law. Such a king neither expects nor deserves love, but Henry I. was regarded with a mixed feeling of confidence and awe, and the result of his rule was better than that of many who are called benefactors."

Prof. Stubbs does not much diverge from the familiar lines in drawing the character of Stephen, whom the English people so decidedly preferred to Henry's daughter, the imperious, self-willed woman whom we know as the Empress Maude. Stephen was a brave man, merciful and generous, and had considerable military experience, but he was not gifted with a strong will or a clear head, and from the beginning of his reign neither felt nor inspired confidence. His turbulent reign has indirectly an important bearing on constitutional history, as showing the evils from which the nation had before escaped. It was the period at which, for once, the feudal principle got its own way in England. It proved the wisdom of the Conqueror and his sons in repressing that principle, and it forced on the nation and its rulers those reforms by which, in the succeeding reign, the recurrence of such a result was made impossible. The terrible discipline of anarchy, prolonged for nearly twenty years, during which, all pressure of legal government being removed, opportunity was given for every sort of combination and excess, opened the eyes of men in general to the sources of their strength and the causes of their weakness.

Of the first Angevin sovereign, Henry II. our author's opinion is, on the whole, quite as flattering as that expressed by any previous historian. He considers that Henry's statesmanlike activity, and power of combining and adapting that which was useful in the old systems of government with that which was desirable and necessary in his own circumstances, gave to the policy which he initiated in England almost the character of a new creation. Indeed, he pronounces Henry II. one of the three great kings who have left on the English Constitution indelible marks of their own individuality. What he reorganized, Edward I. defined and completed, and the Tudor policy which is impersonated in Henry VIII. tested to the utmost the soundness of the fabric. The Constitution stood the shock, and the Stuarts paid the cost of the experiment. Each of the three sovereigns had a strong idiosyncrasy, and in each case the state of things on which he acted was such as to make the impression of personal character distinct and permanent. In Henry II. our author sees a man of keen, bright intellect, patient, laborious, methodical, ambitious within certain well-defined limits, tenacious of power, ingenious even to minuteness in expedients, prompt and energetic in execution, at once unscrupulous and cautious. During the later stages of his career he gave way to violent passion and degrading license, but Prof. Stubbs cannot discover that his private vices made any mark on his public life, and he continued to the last a most industrious, active, and business-like king. There was nothing in him of the hero, and of the patriot scarcely more than an almost instinctive knowledge of the needs of his people, a knowledge which can hardly ever be said to be the result of sympathy. On the whole, however, Prof. Stubbs considers that the English nation should gratefully recognize his merit as a ruler in the vastness of the benefits that resulted from the labors even of a selfish life. We may add that the author deems the king to have been right in the controversy with Becket, and acquits him of responsibility for that prelate's murder.

Of Richard Lion Heart we are told that, while he was no Englishman, it by no means follows that he gave to his continental possessions the love or care he refused to his insular kingdom. His ambition was that of a mere warrior, who would fight for anything whatever, but who would sell everything that was worth fighting for. He was a bad king; his great exploits, his military skill, his splendor and extravagance, his poetical tastes, his adventurous spirit, do not serve to cloak his entire want of sympathy, or even of consideration, for his people. It was fortunate for his island subjects that they saw so little of him; but they heard much of his achievements, and reconciled themselves in the best way they could to his continual exactions. Under his ministers they had good peace, although they paid for it heavily; but the very means that were taken to tax them trained them, and set them thinking. From a social point of view, the years of his reign seem to have been years of progress. There was increase of wealth, and of the comfort which arises from security—a little respite before the tyranny that was coming. The portrait of his brother John is drawn with an acrid pen. Our author deems him the very worst of English kings—a man whom no oaths could bind, no pressure of conscience, no consideration of policy, restrain from evil; a faithless son, a treacherous brother, an ungrateful master; to his people a hated tyrant. Polluted with every crime that could disgrace a man, false to every obligation that should bind a king, he had lost half his inheritance by sloth, and ruined and desolated the rest. Not by any means devoid of natural ability, craft, or energy, with his full share of the personal valor and accomplishments of his house, he yet failed in every design he undertook, and had to bear humiliations which, although not without parallel, never fell on one who deserved them more thoroughly, or received less sympathy under them. In the whole view there is no redeeming trait; John is described as no less incapable of receiving a good impression than of carrying out a wise resolution.

The picture of Henry III. is drawn in neutral tints, and the author seems to prize but lightly the private virtues of a man who proved a shiftless and inefficient sovereign. Yet the studious Henry was among the foremost actors in the history of his reign, and he, too, had what our author likes to term a very distinct idiosyncrasy. Accomplished, refined, liberal, magnificent, rash rather than brave, impulsive and ambitious, pious, and in an ordinary sense virtuous, he was yet utterly devoid of all elements of greatness. The events of his reign brought out in fatal relief all his faults and weaknesses, making even such good points as he possessed contribute to establish the general conviction of his folly and falseness. Unlike his father, who was incapable of receiving any impression, Henry was so susceptible of impressions that none of them could last long. John's heart, says our author, was of millstone, Henry's of wax, yet they had in common a certain feminine quality of irresolute pertinacity which it would be a mockery to call elasticity. Both contrived to make inveterate enemies; both had a gift of rash, humorous, unpardonable sarcasm; both were utterly deficient in a sense of truth or justice. Henry had, no doubt, to pay for some of the sins of John; he inherited personal enmities and utterly baseless ideas as to the character of English royalty. He outlived the enmities, and in the hour of his triumph found that his ideas could not be realized. On the whole, his character would hardly seem to be worth analysis, except as a contrast to that of Simon de Montfort, whom our author styles his brilliant rival.

Simon is described by Prof. Stubbs as possessing all the virtues, the strength, the grace that Henry wanted; and what advantages he lacked, the failings of the King supplied. If the famous Earl of Leicester must be charged with too great ambition, too violent a temper, too strong an instinct of aggression, his faults, in our author's opinion, will not outweigh his virtues. His errors were the result of what seemed to him necessity, or of temptations that involved him in a position from which he could not recede. Had he lived longer, the prospect of the throne might have opened before him, and he might have become a destroyer instead of a savior. For, had he succeeded in such a design, our author thinks he could not have made a better king than Edward; while, had he failed, the nation would have lain at the feet of Edward, a ruler whose shining qualities would have made him more dangerous as a despot than his father's vices had made him in his futile attempt at despotism. Of course De Montfort cannot be called happy in the opportunity of his death, yet it may have been best for England that he lived no longer. He was greater, we are told, as an opponent of tyranny than as a deviser of liberties. The fetters imposed on royal autocracy, cumbrous and entangled as they were, seem to have been an integral part of his policy, and the means he took for admitting the nation to self-government wear very much the look of an occasional or party expedient, which a longer tenure of undivided power might have led him either to develop or to discard. The idea of representative government had, however, ripened in his hand, and although the germ of the growth lay in the primitive institutions of the land, Simon de Montfort has the merit of having been one of the first to see the uses and the glories which it would ultimately evolve.

Prof. Stubbs has his favorites, and the chief of these is Edward I. This prince had learned, he tells us, a great lesson from his father's shortcomings and misfortunes; he had reaped the fruits of an education which had been a long struggle on the one hand to remedy his father's errors, and, on the other, to humble his father's enemies. He is depicted as inheriting to the full the Plantagenet love of power, and as possessing in the highest degree the masterful qualities and manifold accomplishments of his race. The sterling stamp of his character and his capacity of self-control are traced by the author to the circumstances of his nurture. He had been brought up, we are reminded, in a house of which purity and piety were the redeeming characteristics, and had been impressed with these virtues rather than with the vices of insincerity and dishonesty, which in his father's case they had not served to conceal. Truthful, honorable, temperate, and chaste—frugal, cautious, resolute—great in counsel, ingenious in contrivance, rapid in execution, he had all the gifts of Henry II., the earliest of the Angevins, without the latter's vices, and he had, too, that sympathy with the people he ruled, the want of which alone would have robbed the character of Henry II. of veritable greatness. Edward I. was a law-abiding king, one who kept his word. If sometimes he kept the law in the letter rather than in the spirit, and used his promises as the maximum rather than the minimum of his good intentions—if the historian can trace in his conduct a captiousness, an overreadiness to make the most of his legal advantages and to strain legal rights beyond the line of equity—yet Prof. Stubbs maintains that when we compare him with the kings that went before and that came after, we shall see cause not so much to justify his conduct as to wonder at the greatness of his moderation, at the wise use of his boundless opportunities.

Much as the author of this history admires the personal character and the great achievements in legislation of this particular ruler, he concedes that the scheme of government devised by Edward I. was one unlikely to suit a bad king. The system was the system of a king who felt himself at one with the nation he governed, who was content to act as the head and hand of the national body. In sharing political power with his people, he gave to the Parliament more than was consistent with a royal despotism; but he retained in his own hands more than was compatible with the theory of limited monarchy. He was willing to have no interest apart from the English commonwealth; but, for all that, he would not be less than every inch a king. The share of power which he gave up was given to be used in concert with him; the share that he kept was withheld that he might control the aims and exertions of the national strength. There was what is called in modern phrase solidarity between him and his people. Like so many great men, he acted as if he thought death would spare him, as if he at least would live forever. He seems to have never calculated on the succession of a king who might maintain a separate interest apart from or opposed to that of the nation. Until a few months before his death he appears not to have realized the danger of leaving the fortunes of the people he had loved at the mercy of a son whose character he had reason to mistrust and whose ability for government he had never found time to train.

If the figure of Edward I. is here more grandly outlined and more warmly tinged than we are wont to see it on the historical canvas, on the other hand, the author's sketch of his unlucky son presents the well-known features of Edward II., though here again there are some subtle touches. The hero of Marlowe's tragedy, of that death scene which Charles Lamb affirmed "moves pity and terror beyond any scene, ancient or modern," was not, says Prof. Stubbs, so much out of accord with his age as might be inferred from a hasty glance at his history and fate. He is not without some tincture of the chivalrous qualities that are impersonated in his son, the victor of Cressy. He has the instinctive courage of his house, although he is neither an accomplished knight nor a great commander. But Edward II. has no large aims, no policy beyond the cunning of unscrupulous selfishness. He has no kingly pride, or sense of duty, no industry, or shame, or piety. He is the first king since the conquest who is not a man of business, well acquainted with the routine of government. He makes amusement the employment of his life; vulgar pomp, heartless extravagance, lavish improvidence, selfish indolence, make him a fit centre of an intriguing court. He does no good to any one, bestowing even his favors in such a way as to bring his favorites to destruction, and sows enmities broadcast by insult or imprudent neglect. His reign, undoubtedly, is a tragedy, but one, our author thinks, that lacks in its true form the element of pity, for, on his part, Prof. Stubbs can see nothing in Edward, miserable as his fate is, that invites or deserves sympathy. It is certain that this king is often described by his contemporaries as worthless. He does little harm, it is true, intentionally, except by acts of vengeance that wear the garb of justice. His faults, in a word, are quite as much negative as positive; his character is not so much vicious as devoid of virtue. The author contrasts him to his disadvantage with both Henry III. and Richard II., pointing out that he does not bend to the storm like the former, or attempt to control it like the latter. He has neither the pliancy of the one nor the enterprise of the other. History, of course, does not condemn him, because he failed to sustain the part which his father had played, for the alternation of strong and weak, good and bad, kings is too common a phenomenon to carry with it so heavy a sentence. The case against Edward II. is that he deliberately defied his father's counsels and disregarded his example. For him it cannot be pleaded, as for Richard II. it may, that he paid in any way the penalty of his predecessor's sins; that he fell under enmities that another had provoked, or under the tide of influences that the preceding monarch was strong enough to stem. Edward II. voluntarily threw away his advantages, and gave to his enemies the opportunities they were prompt to seize. His difficulties were of his own making, his peril was self-incurred, and his fate, hard and undeserved as it may seem, was the direct result of his own faults and follies.

Prof. Stubbs thinks that Edward III. was far from deserving the reputation which popular histories have made for him. He was not a statesman, although he possessed some qualifications which might have made him a successful one. He was a warrior—ambitious, unscrupulous, selfish, extravagant, and ostentatious. His obligations as a king sat very lightly on him. He felt himself bound by no special duty either to maintain the theory of royal supremacy or to follow a policy which would benefit his people. Like Richard I., he valued England primarily as a source of supplies, and he saw no risk in parting with prerogatives which his grandfather would never have resigned. Had he been without foreign ambitions, he might have risen to the dignity of a tyrant or sunk to the level of a voluptuary. But he had great ambition, and an energy for which that ambition found ample employment. The author makes it clear that while the diversion of Edward's activities to foreign wars worked indirectly to the benefit of his people, it was productive of an enormous amount of suffering. The general record of the reign is thus full of strong contrasts, the glory and the growth of the nation being dearly bought by blood, treasure, and agony of many sorts. Much, indeed, of the lustre of the reign, on which later historians love to dwell, was due to retrospect at a time when it had not yet become clear that the evils which caused men to look back on the epoch of Edward III. as an age of gold were all results of his foolish policy and selfish designs. As to his eldest son, the Black Prince, we infer that Prof. Stubbs considers him, too, greatly overrated, from the fact that he does not give so much as a line in these volumes to an estimate of his character, though in a later installment of this work the victor of Poitiers is compared with the Regent Duke of Bedford.

The last portrait which the author turns aside from the main current of his inquiry to sketch for us is that of Richard II. It is most carefully and judicially executed, and differs considerably from the conception of this ill-fated king, borrowed by Shakespeare from the chroniclers who wrote under the influence of the House of Lancaster. It has been customary for modern historians to draw a parallel between this prince and Edward II., and there was, of course, a sinister correspondence in the alleged circumstances of their deaths. But the author of these volumes deems it more just and suggestive to compare the deposed and murdered son of the Black Prince with his more fortunate grandfather, whose spurious chivalry and magnanimity left him heir to difficulties which he could not overcome, and a theory of government which could never be realized. Richard had, we are told, a very lofty idea of his dignity, a very distinct conception of the powers, the functions, and the duties of royalty. His legislation is marked by real policy and intelligible purpose; he reduced to a system, and attempted to realize in their most definite form, the principles upon which his grandfather had irregularly acted. His personal character is throughout the reign a problem—in the earlier years because it is almost impossible to detect his independent action, and in the later ones because of its surprising inconsistencies. It is certain that many of those who came closest to him loved and esteemed him, whereas his warlike grandfather had died unlamented. Richard had many friends in the hour of his adversity, and there were few traces in his fall of the bitterness that was so distinct a feature in the overthrow of Edward II. In practice he was not the selfish, arbitrary despot that his grandfather had often shown himself to be; but he aimed at the recognition of a theory of despotism, and as has so often happened, both before and since, the frank assertion of principles brought upon their upholder a much severer doom than befel the cunning autocrat who had practised them.

These glimpses of the happy touch with which, in the intervals of more profound research, Prof. Stubbs recasts or illumines the well-worn materials of personal history, may lead the reader, it is hoped, to examine the main design and substantial kernel of the book. The study of institutions may be less attractive but it is more fruitful than that of persons, and in the hands of an earnest and far-sighted inquirer, it, too, acquires a vital and immediate interest. In a sentence of his preface the author indicates the point of view from which constitutional history, to be readable, should be written. The roots, he says, of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present comes to be what it is. M. W. H.

A Delightful New Novel.

Those story writers who have the desire and capacity of self-improvement will do well to study a model of artistic composition presented in *Louisiana*, by Mrs. F. H. BURNETT (Scribner's). From every point of view this is an admirable piece of work. The motive is strong, the situations striking, and the construction deft, while the characterization is firm yet delicate, and transfused, in one instance, with an exquisite tenderness and a poignant pathos. The whole action of the little drama is performed by four persons, but so dexterously are the scenes managed and so keen is the interest maintained that we are surprised to note upon reflection with what a Greek economy of materials the effect has been produced. We do not propose to strike the keynote of the story, or to outline its plot, for no lover of good novels is likely to miss this book, and we would subtract nothing from his forthcoming pleasure. But we may say in general that there is a gleam of something more than talent in the author's power over the emotions. Certainly our sympathies are strangely wrought upon by the figure of the old farmer, who sees his child outgrowing the rude and narrow ways of home, and whose heart breaks with the thought that his daughter is ashamed of him. There is also much dainty irony, almost too dainty, perhaps, to be seized by the careless reader, in the sketch of a feminine literary person, who has pat all the shibboleths of æsthetic circles, and who by a somewhat fantastic concomitance is represented as having her gowns made at Worth's. Between this young woman, whose effusions are invariably rejected by the editors, and the brother, whose contributions seem to be in request, the improvement in respect of insight and genuine, robust sentiment is nicely graduated, and both are skilfully contrasted, not by any means to their advantage, with the native breadth and loftiness of soul exhibited by one whose unconventional manners and defective education have been to them a curious and not unamusing study.

Prof. Huxley's Latest Volume.

Seldom have the results of independent research in any field of science been invested with so much attractiveness and been turned to such large and fruitful issues as in Prof. HUXLEY's new book, entitled *The Crayfish* (Appletons). The general reader must not be misled by the title into thinking the present work a technical monograph on a particular group of animals. The common English crayfish, with which almost everybody in the British Islands is familiar, is here made the text of a discussion in which we are led, step by step, from everyday knowledge to the widest generalizations, and the most difficult problems of zoölogy. Those who follow its pages will find themselves brought face to face with all the great questions of biological science which command so much attention at the present day, and they will learn at least the method by which alone we can hope to obtain satisfactory answers. For a clear and exhaustive survey of the morphology and physiology of that tribe of the crustacea to which the crayfish belongs, and to which our common lobster is allied, we must refer the reader to the book itself, but we would direct notice at this time to the chapters which embody the author's latest conclusions or conjectures regarding the broadest and most important topics of zoölogical investigation. We would mark, in particular, as likely to prove of signal utility to the young student of science, the author's lucid and, we think, unassailable definition of the word "species," on whose meaning we need not say, so many controversies have turned.

It is, indeed, impossible, although many cultivated persons have yet to recognize the fact, to enter on the discussion of any biological question, without an exact conception of the meaning of the terms "species" and "variety." The ambiguity which is so often observed in the employment of those words is, no doubt, partly owing to certain theological assumptions, but partly, also, to the fact that the word "species" in biology has two significations. In the strictly morphological sense, a species is simply an assemblage of individuals which agree with one another, and differ from the rest of the living world in the sum of their morphological characters. The great majority of species described in works on systematic zoology are merely morphological species. That is to say, one or more specimens of a kind of animal having been obtained, these had been found to differ from any previously known in a given number of points, and this common difference constitutes the definition of the new species, and is all the designators really know about its distinctness. With the progress of investigation, however, the formation of specific groups has been more or less restricted, and qualified by considerations based upon what is known respecting the laws of variation. It is a matter of observation that progeny are never exactly like their parents, but present small and constant differences from them. Hence when specific identity is predicated of a group of animals, the meaning conveyed is not that they are all exactly alike, but only that their individual differences are so small and so fugitive that they lie within the probable limits of individual variation. It is sometimes found, on the other hand, that a single member of a species will exhibit a more or less marked variation, which, instead of disappearing, is propagated through all the offspring of that individual, and may even become intensified in them. It is in this way that what is termed a "variety" or "race" is generated within the species, which variety or race, if nothing were known respecting its origin, might have every claim to be regarded as a separate morphological species. It is also a matter of observation that modification of the physical conditions, under which a given species lives, favors the development of varieties and races. In such cases the intermediate forms may die out, and thus the evidence of variation might be in time wholly effaced.

From what has been said, it follows that the groups designated as morphological species are merely provisional classifications, indicative simply of the present state of our knowledge. We call two groups "species," if we know of no transitional forms between them, and if there is no reason to believe that the differences which they present are such as may arise in the ordinary course of variation. The moment adequate reason for such a belief is discovered we call each group "varieties" or "races." And it is impossible to say beforehand whether the progress of inquiry into the characters of any group of individuals may not prove that what have hitherto been taken for mere varieties are distinct morphological species, or whether, on the contrary, it may not prove that what have hitherto been accepted as true species are, after all, mere varieties.

So much for the meaning assigned to the word species from a morphological point of view. In the physiological sense the term signifies, first, a group of animals, the members of which are capable of completely fertile union with one another, but not with the members of any other group; and secondly, it is used by writers of a certain bias to signify all the descendants of a primitive ancestor or ancestors, supposed to have originated otherwise than by ordinary generation. As regards the first sense, Prof. Huxley reminds us that many groups, arbitrarily or provisionally designated as species, are demonstrated to be in fact varieties through the discovery of new hybrids or mongrels. The other sense in which the word species is applied from a physiological point of view, viz., the hypothesis of a primitive ancestor brought into being by some other process than that of normal generation, leads Prof. Huxley to examine the final problem of biology, which is to find out why animals, like the crayfish, for example, possessed of such structure and active powers, and so localized, exist.

It would be difficult, he says, to frame more than two fundamental hypotheses in attempting to solve this problem. Either we must seek the origin of crayfishes, for instance, in conditions extraneous to the observed course of natural operations, refer it, in other words, to an abrupt, abnormal act of creative power, or we must seek for it in conditions afforded by the usual course of nature, in which case the hypothesis assumes some shape of the doctrine of evolution. There are, we should remember, two forms of the latter hypothesis, for it may be assumed, on the one hand, that crayfishes have come into existence independently of any other form of living matter, which constitutes the theory of spontaneous generation, or abiogenesis; or, on the other hand, we may suppose that crayfishes have resulted from the modification of some other form of living matter; and this is what Prof. Huxley, borrowing a useful word from the French scientists, would designate as "transformism."

As regards the hypothesis of creation, our author thinks that little need be said. From a scientific point of view the adoption of this speculation is, in his judgment, the same thing as an admission that the problem is not susceptible of solution. Moreover, the proposition that a given thing has been created, whether true or false, is not capable of proof. By the nature of the case direct evidence of the fact is not obtainable, and the only indirect evidence satisfactory would be such as amounted to proof that natural agencies are incompetent to cause the existence of the thing in question. Such evidence, however, is out of our reach, for the most that can be demonstrated in any case is that no known natural cause is competent to produce a given effect; and it is an obvious blunder to confound the demonstration of our own ignorance with a proof of the impotence of natural causes. But apart from the philosophical worthlessness of the hypothesis of creation, Prof. Huxley would regard it as a waste of time to discuss a view which, in his opinion, nobody now upholds. "Unless," he says, "I am greatly mistaken, no one at the present day, possessed of knowledge sufficient to give his opinion importance, is prepared to maintain that the ancestors of the various species of crayfish"—and of course the author's remark applies to all other species of animals—"were fabricated out of inorganic matter, or brought from nothingness into being by a creative fiat." Our only refuge, therefore, seems to be the hypothesis of evolution. But here, too, with respect to the doctrine of spontaneous generation, or abiogenesis, Prof. Huxley suggests, in view of a proper economy of labor, we should do well to postpone its discussion, also, until such time as the smallest fragment of evidence that a crayfish can be evolved by natural agencies from not-living matter is brought forward.

In the mean while, the hypothesis of transformism remains in possession of the field. It follows that, in our author's opinion, the only profitable inquiry is, how far are the facts collected in the present volume susceptible of interpretation on the hypothesis that all the existing kinds of crayfish are the product of the metamorphosis of other forms of living beings, and that the biological phenomena which they exhibit are the results of the interaction through past time of two series of factors—the one a process of morphological and concomitant physiological modification, the other a process of change in the condition of the earth's surface. And he does not hesitate to affirm, as the result of his special investigation into the ætiology of the crayfishes, that all the known facts are in harmony with the requirements of the theory that they have been gradually evolved from a primitive form in the course of the mesozoic and subsequent epochs of the world's history. That is his conclusion, and he bids us reflect that the only alternative supposition is that the numerous successive and coexistent forms of the most insignificant animals, whose differences require careful study for their discrimination, have been separately and independently fabricated and put into the localities where we find them. By whatever verbal fog the question at issue may be hidden, this is the real nature of the dilemma presented to us, not only by the crayfish, but by every animal and by every plant—from man to the humblest animalcule—from the spreading beech and towering pine to the *micrococci*, which lie at the limit of microscopic visibility.

STUDYING ART IN PARIS—EXPERIENCES OF AN AMERICAN.

Gerome's, Cabanel's, and Leyman's Ateliers—Sketch of Gerome—How the Students Live—Aristocracy of Poverty—Row by Gerome's Students and Closing of his Atelier.

PARIS, April 13.—One of the first things which strike an American art student on coming to Paris is the amount and endless variety of art which he sees here, and the interest which every one takes in art. At home he has seldom known any one except artists who cared much for art, but in Paris almost everybody he meets seems to take an interest in it. Everything is keyed up to a higher plane of art than he has ever before experienced, and he is surrounded with an artistic atmosphere which exhilarates him. He also meets so many artists of great excellence that he is either discouraged or else finds his ambition spurred into a new and more vigorous activity.

The French students, even boys, show remarkable artistic ability. They seem to inherit an aptitude for art, and, being set early at work under good teachers, they acquire unusual proficiency at an early age. According to the old legend, when Sir Isaac Newton visited France, he could not get over his surprise at hearing little children speaking French better than grown-up people in England spoke it. An American art student in Paris at first experiences a somewhat similar feeling on witnessing the skill with which French boys in the art schools draw and paint.

American students are not only surprised but sometimes amused at the exhibition of artistic knowledge and criticism where they did not suppose it to exist. An American friend of mine, who had been in Paris several years, while in the country during the summer vacation, coming across a picturesque-looking beggar that he thought would make a good subject for a painting, hired him to pose as a model. After my friend had made the first rough *ébauche*, the beggar walked up to the easel, and, surveying the work with a critical eye, shook his head solemnly, and saying to the artist, "Young man, you are not capable," walked off with an air of disgust. My friend called to him to come back, but it was of no use. The vagabond disdained to pose for a painter whom he did not consider capable.

I entered the Beaux Arts under Gérôme, and was at once impressed with his ability, his thoroughness, and his conscientiousness as a teacher. I was also at first somewhat disturbed by his apparent ferocity. The expression of his eye is glaring, and strikes a stranger as savage and relentless. His voice and manner deepen this impression. But one soon learns that Gérôme's ferocity is harmless, that although severe in his criticisms he is just, and that he is always ready to help a pupil who shows talent and earnestness of purpose.

Gérôme's personal appearance is so distinguished that he would be a marked man anywhere. His head is unusually fine, and his manners are so high-bred and dignified that, although he is rather slight in person, his bearing is impressive and commanding. When the Russian Grand Duke (whose name I have forgotten) visited the Beaux Arts, Gérôme showed him through his atelier, and we were all struck with our teacher's superior bearing to that of the Russian magnate, who looked like a very ordinary person alongside of Gérôme.

In fact, all the distinguished painters that I have seen in Paris look like men of great general ability, who would have made their mark in any profession. I am inclined to think it is time the idea that when a person is not fit for anything else he may excel in art were exploded. So far as my observation has gone, a man who is lacking in brains and force of character is not apt to achieve anything of much account in art.

Gérôme has some peculiarities of manner which once in a while occasion amusement as well as excite alarm. When he comes upon a piece of work that does not seem to have any well-defined ideas, he has a habit of vehemently saying, "What is that? What is that?" and suddenly turning around and looking at the student with his ferocious glare. This is usually very disconcerting, but occasionally he meets with a student so conceited that his "What is that?" and his penetrating glare produce no effect. On one occasion an American student from beyond the Mississippi, whose conceit is enormous, and who was fond of talking about "a voice from the breezy prairies of the mighty West," being assailed by Gérôme's incisive "What is that?" repeated over and over again, with increasing emphasis, turned to his fellow students and asked, "What is the French for trees?" Having been told the French for trees, when Gérôme repeated his "What is that?" the self-poised American replied, "Trees! trees!" in a tone of inquiring solicitude which plainly said: "Did you never see a tree? Have you no trees in France?" The students roared with laughter, and for once Gérôme was nonplussed, and passed on without further comment.

Gérôme is as severe on his own work as he is on that of his students. Years ago he used to tear up his paintings if they did not come up to his standard. He is rich, but work seems to be a necessity of his existence, and he is said to be as industrious now as he was when years ago he worked for bread. He is always early at the school, and in every way sets a good example to the students. In the summer, when he lives in the country near Paris, he gallops in on horseback, and is never behind time. When he is kept away by sickness or any other unavoidable detention, he always sends a note to the school stating the fact, so that the students may know the reason of his absence. He is faithful and conscientious in the discharge of his duties as a teacher, and tries to find out the artistic weaknesses of his pupils, so that he may strengthen and build them up where they most need reënforcing. It is interesting to watch him as he criticises the work of a student and tries to find out the central thought or idea of it, so as to see with what success the student has embodied and expressed it in his work. He usually succeeds in getting at the very heart of the matter, and is thus enabled to give the student exactly the help he needs.

There are two other ateliers in the Beaux Arts besides Gérôme's—Cabanel's and Leyman's. Cabanel's atelier is the strongest of the three. He has the cleverest students, most of them being French. As soon as Americans and Englishmen get into an atelier they weaken it in the estimation of the Parisians, and it begins to run down, because the best French students will not go to an atelier that is thronged with English and American pupils. Gérôme is so cosmopolitan in his artistic sympathies that he will take a foreign student as soon as a native one. Besides, if he sees that a student has talent, he will not be very exacting with regard to his proficiency, whereas Cabanel will only take those students who can already do pretty fair work.

Each atelier has its distinctive character, which it is not easy to describe. No two students in Gérôme's atelier paint alike, yet all of his students exhibit the Gérôme characteristic. This may be stated as the subduing of color to modelling and drawing. The distinguishing characteristic of Cabanel's atelier is the opposite of this; there color predominates over modelling and drawing, and strong effects are sought in contrasts of light and shade. As a student from Ohio said: "They sling color in Cabanel's." Leyman's atelier is generally considered the least desirable for a student to enter, because the work there is characterized by extreme coldness and a stiff mechanical execution.

English and American students, on coming to Paris, find themselves subjected to much severer criticism than they experienced at home. They also find that they must work harder than they before had any idea of, if they would excel in art. In fact, they learn that nothing but unremitting drudgery will enable them to take even respectable rank in their profession, no matter how much raw talent or genius they may have.

The average cost of living in Paris among the American students is $650 a year. Some have to get along on $500, and others swell out on an allowance of $800 or more. The general custom is to hire a lodging room and take one's meals at a restaurant. The evening is usually spent in a café, where, at a trifling expense, we can have all needed comforts, a talk over the work of the day, and compare notes on art, or otherwise enjoy ourselves. The poor students do not feel their poverty in Paris as they do at home, because things are peculiarly arranged here to give comfort to poor people who are intelligent and refined, without in any wise trenching on their self-respect. There are so many persons of learning and distinction in Paris who are poor that there is what might be called an aristocracy of poverty here, and everything seems to be adapted to minister to their comfort. A man can spend an afternoon or evening in a café at a very little expense, where he has access to all the papers and periodicals, and is surrounded by high-bred gentlemen. Here he will see distinguished-looking personages, with heads like the antique busts in the Louvre, and the manners of polished courtiers, many of them decorated with the ribbon of the Legion of Honor, sipping their six cents' worth of wine and reading the papers with an air of profound satisfaction. One elegant old gentleman whom I have often met, whose apparent poverty is radiated by his exquisitely genial urbanity, and who, I am told, is a member of the French Senate, always drinks three sous' worth of hot milk, and yet he is treated with as much courtesy and deference as though he spent Napoleons instead of sous. The social atmosphere which is exhaled from such a state of things is soothing to the feelings and exhilarating to the spirits of poor students who have to count their pennies on all occasions, and renders life in Paris exceedingly attractive to them.

Gérôme's students are in rather a disconsolate mood just now on account of the closing of his atelier about the middle of March. At the end of *concours* week, when the students' work for the previous term is passed upon with a view to their standing and advancement, a number of new students are usually admitted to the atelier. These novices are sometimes unmercifully hazed by the French students. They all have to treat the atelier, and things sometimes run to excess. The French students sometimes strip their young countrymen, make them pose as nude models, and stand on their heads; but no English or American student has ever submitted to such an indignity. In March, at the close of *concours* week in Gérôme's atelier, a number of students came in, and the usual hazing began. The Frenchmen attempted to make a little Englishman strip and stand on his head. He resisted. He was then seized by the hazers, who sought to strip him by force. His countrymen and the Americans rushed to his assistance and a tremendous row ensued. Gérôme happened to be yet in the building, and hearing the noise he came suddenly into the atelier just as the struggle and the noise had culminated and the little Englishman's clothes had been torn to shreds. He was inexpressibly indignant, lectured us severely, said he was ashamed to be the teacher of such students, decreed that the atelier should be closed indefinitely, and declared that if such a thing ever occurred again he would resign. He would not probably have been so severe had it not been that the Inspector of the Beaux Arts had already determined to close the atelier for a month on account of a row we had got into with Leyman eight or ten days before. We were all very much taken aback, as the closing of the atelier was a serious thing for us. The French students sought to throw all the blame on the foreigners, and were furious against us, saying that if we had let them have their way, and had not resisted their efforts to strip the little Englishman, there would have been no trouble. But the French are genial and good-natured, and do not hold malice. When the atelier shall be reopened next October we shall doubtless all come together again on the old friendly terms. L. M. D.

OPIUM STEADILY ADVANCING.

Morphine up Already to $1 per Drachm—Fallacious Hopes of the Persian Supply.

Morphine, which sold for $3.80 per ounce in December last, $4 in January, and $4.50 in February, has now gone up to $5.25, and even at that figure no orders are taken by the manufacturers for any quantities that may be wanted for speculative purposes, but only as much as may be absolutely required by their customers for the retail demand. Neither of the manufacturing firms is willing to say how much of the drug is held by them, but all agree in saying that there is a great deal of morphine held by private speculators, waiting for still further advances. Lanman & Kemp estimate the amount so held in the entire country at about ten thousand ounces. Powers & Weightman estimate the stock thus held in New York at from five to six thousand ounces. Much of this was purchased some time ago at prices which would not now admit of sale at present rates without loss, and will consequently be held for the great rise which is now deemed inevitable. The retail price of morphine has gone from seventy-five cents per drachm up to $1 within the past two weeks. Only two other products of opium, narceine and codeine, are manufactured in this country, and they only in such exceedingly small quantities, owing to the very limited demand for them, that as yet no noteworthy change in their prices has taken place. Both are always very much more expensive than morphine.

Opium now commands $7.50 per pound, duty paid, in gold. Latest advices by Cole's London circulars state that the market rate in Smyrna was 250 piasters per basket, and that holders were firm. Buyers have been offering 240 piasters, but no sales at that figure are reported, and sales at 260 are known to have been made.

Some dealers talk hopefully of Persian opium as a dark horse in the present race, but there is little real prospect of benefit from that quarter. But a very small proportion of the Persian opium ever reaches the required 9 per cent. of morphia, below which it is not allowed to be imported to this country. Generally it runs from 4.8 to 6 per cent. In some rare instances very small quantities of it have been found which contained as much as 11 per cent., but all there is or is likely to be obtained of that grade would not furnish a day's supply of morphine for this country alone. Like the Malwa, Patna, Benares, and Egyptian opiums, it is richest in the narcotic principle, and is best adapted for manufacture into smoking opium. It is kneaded by its growers with some sort of fatty oil, which gives it a very offensive smell, and though this might be no objection to its use by the manufacturers of morphine, were it rich enough the peculiarity would do very much to prevent its use by other consumers of the crude drug.

The holders of the bulk of the opium in the market profess to have no anxiety whatever respecting Persian opium or any other relief from their monopoly. The latest telegrams received by Lanman & Kemp, who are outside the speculative pool, report that in Smyrna few parties now estimate the incoming crop higher than 2,000 cases. That will leave it 500 cases short of the amount at which Mr. Dutilh is confident that there will be such scarcity throughout the world as will practically put the entire control in the hands of present speculative holders. What the result of that may be is indicated by the prices reigning in January 1869, when there was no such powerful combination as now controls the market and the stock on hand was much greater and better distributed than at present. The price then was $12.50 gold, in bond. The duty at that time was $2.50 per pound, and gold was quoted at 140 which made the price of opium $21.50 per pound, currency, duty paid.